



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,552	02/03/2000	Guido Maurizio Oliva	3572-15	7648

7590

01/15/2003

Nixon & Vanderhye P C
1100 N Glebe Road 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

LESTER, EVELYN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2873

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Appli cation No.

09/497,552

Applicant(s)

OLIVA, GUIDO MAURIZIO

Examiner

Evelyn A. L ster

Art Unit

2873

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sh et with the correspond nc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 27 and 28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,11-15,29 and 32-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10,16-26,30 and 31 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2873

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation to a “first means **exteriorly surrounding** an outer edge of the focusing lens” was not originally described in the disclosure, and is considered to be new matter. Further, there is no description as to what this means in the disclosure. The original disclosure has description at page 9 and page 17 of the specification which describes what is meant by “surrounding portion.” It does not provide for “exteriorly surrounding an outer edge of the focusing lens.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

Art Unit: 2873

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 32-35, as far as these claims are currently understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Plesko (U.S. patent 5,886,332).

Please note Figures 9, 10A and 10B and their accompanying text. Especially note text at column 7, lines 3-42.

Plesko discloses the claimed invention of an optical device for focusing a laser beam which comprises a focusing lens(2, 320) upon which the laser beam (from source S) is directed and a first mean for selection only a central portion of the laser beam wherein the first means is directly applied on the focusing lens. Further wherein the laser beam is substantially elliptical and astigmatic beam.

With respect to claim 34, Plesko's invention is adapted to obstruct the propagation of periphery portion by scattering.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible

Art Unit: 2873

harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11-15, 29 and 32-36 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of copending Application No. 09/773,384 (which is also published application number US 2002/0050517 A1, filed on February 1, 2001). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applications each claimed invention is only a merely variation of the other.

Each claimed invention recites an optical device, wherein a laser light beam is focused by a focusing lens and is itself the diaphragm (claim 1 of the instant invention and claim 13 of the other application's claimed invention), and wherein the central portion of the laser light beam

Art Unit: 2873

propagates or is emitted, and further wherein the aperture has a Fresnel number less than 2.

Clearly the boundary or scope of the claimed inventions are the same, with only obvious variations which would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6-10, 16-26, 30 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claims 27 and 28 are allowed.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The reasons for indicating allowable subject matter were given in paper no. 9.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10-28-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the obviousness type double patenting rejection, this rejection is made

Art Unit: 2873

“provisionally” because the related subject matter is part of a pending application before the Patent Office. This rejection is not premature because it is made provisionally, and is hereby maintained in this office action.

With respect to the prior art rejection, the Applicant’s attempt to amend over the prior art is considered new matter, as noted above. The rejection is maintained this office action for as far as the claimed invention is understood in light of the specification.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2873

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to E.A. Lester whose telephone number is (703) 308-4943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from about 9:30 am to 6 pm (subject to an extended flex schedule).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y. Epps, can be reached on (703) 308-4883. The fax number for Technology Center 2800 is (703) 308-7724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Evelyn A. Lester
Primary Examiner
AU 2873
January 12, 2003